REMARKS

Applicants have thoroughly considered the Examiner's remarks in the October 5, 2006 Office action and have amended the application to more clearly set forth the invention. This Amendment A amends claims 1, 3, 4, 16, 21, and 26.

Claims 1-34 are thus presented in the application for further examination. Reconsideration of the application as amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Drawings

FIG. 1 stands objected to for failing to include a legend such as --Prior Art-- since only that which is old is illustrated. Applicants respectfully disagree because FIG. 1 does not merely show the prior art. Rather, FIG. 1 embodies aspects of the invention. For example, Data Collection and Warehousing System 54 in FIG. 1 incorporates aspects of the invention such as described in paragraphs [0020] ("an exemplary embodiment of the invention includes....a data collection and warehousing system 54") and [0021] ("logging software [of the invention], executing on...computing devices...associated with the data warehouse system 54").

As such, Applicants submit that FIG. 1 does not illustrate only that which is old, and respectfully request that the objection to FIG. 1 be removed.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Appl. No. 2002/0023158 to Polizzi et al. (Polizzi). Applicants respectfully disagree. None of the cited references, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest each and every feature claimed in the rejected claims.

Polizzi discloses a system for data *retrieval* (see paragraph [0005]: "retrieving data from a back-end database, preparing a report based upon retrieved data, processing data already resident within the portal system"). In general, Polizzi teaches "a portal architecture to allow a user to view a wide variety of content retrieved from a variety of different computer systems" (see paragraph [0004]). Polizzi does not relate to data *storage*.

7

In contrast to the cited art, aspects of the present invention relate to *organizing* and *storing* data. This is completely different from the data *retrieval* system taught by Polizzi. In aspects of the invention as claimed in claim 1, an expression is evaluated based on a condition associated with data to be stored. The data is stored based on the evaluated expression. Polizzi fails to disclose at least "accessing configuration information associated with the data **to be stored, said configuration information including at least one expression**", "receiving the data including **at least one condition** associated therewith, said condition **affecting storage** of the received data", "evaluating the expression based on the condition associated with the received data; and **storing the received data in accordance with the expression evaluated based on the condition associated with the received data**."

Polizzi teaches jobs for <u>retrieving</u> data and creating reports from <u>retrieved</u> data. Further, Polizzi teaches exception conditions for indicating when an element of a report is out of range (Polizzi, paragraph [0005]). Neither the jobs concept nor the exception conditions of Polizzi relate to the limitations in claim 1. Aspects of the invention as claimed in claim 1 enable data to be logged based on information that is configurable dynamically according to the evaluated expression. Advantageously, aspects of the invention as claimed in claim 1 reduce the amount of memory needed and reduce the complexity of post-storage queries by only storing relevant data. The received data is pre-filtered per configuration information to minimize downstream processing and to enable data sampling prior to storage of the data. (Application, paragraph [0007]).

As such, Polizzi fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claim 1. Applicants submit that the rejection of amended claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

Amended independent claims 16, 21, and 26 include limitations similar to those included in amended claim 1. As such, Applications submit that Polizzi fails to disclose or suggest each and every limitation of amended claims 16, 21, and 26. Amended claims 16, 21, and 26 are allowable for at least the same reasons that amended claim 1 is allowable. In addition, the claims that depend from amended independent claims 1, 16, 21, and 26 are allowable for at least the reasons that the independent claims from which they depend are allowable.

Regarding independent claim 26, the data received is clickstream data (e.g., navigation data corresponding to user navigational patterns). The condition associated with the clickstream

data affects storage of the clickstream data. Polizzi fails to teach the storage of clickstream data as claimed in amended independent claim 26.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Polizzi fails to disclose or suggest at least an expression specifying one or more operations for organizing the received data.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that the claims are allowable for at least the reasons set forth herein. Applicants thus respectfully submit that claims 1-34 as presented are in condition for allowance and respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

Although the prior art made of record and not relied upon may be considered pertinent to the disclosure, none of these references anticipates or makes obvious the recited aspects of the invention. The fact that Applicants may not have specifically traversed any particular assertion by the Office should not be construed as indicating Applicants' agreement therewith.

Applicants wish to expedite prosecution of this application. If the Examiner deems the application to not be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned to discuss making an Examiner's amendment to place the application in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency or overpayment of any required fee during the entire pendency of this application to Deposit Account No. 19-1345.

Respectfully submitted,

/James J. Barta, Jr./

James J. Barta, Jr., Reg. No. 47,409
SENNIGER POWERS
One Metropolitan Square, 16th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63102
(314) 231-5400

JJB/cjl